

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. CR 12-00096 WHA

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

**ORDER ON MOTION FOR STATUS
CONFERENCE AND FINDING OF
EXCLUDABLE TIME**

13 JAMES SHELTON,


14 Defendant.
15 _____/

16 The government filed a motion for a status conference and finding of excludable time. A
17 status conference was held on April 17, 2012. Thus, the motion for a status conference is
18 **GRANTED.** The government also requested exclusion of time from the time of the filing of the
19 instant motion through the date on which the motion was heard, “in light of the unusual
20 procedural history of this case, and the current unconventional posture of this case.”
21 Specifically, the government requested exclusion of time under 18 U.S.C. 3161(h)(1)(D), as a
22 delay resulting from a pretrial motion, and under 18 U.S.C. 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii), which permits
23 exclusion of time when a “case is so unusual or so complex, due to the number of defendants, the
24 nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is
25 unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within
26
27
28

1 the time limits established by this section.” There has not been a sufficient showing to support
2 exclusion of time on the asserted grounds. The motion to exclude time is **DENIED**.

3
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 Dated: April 25, 2012.

7 
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE